

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,020	09/05/2003	Paul Joseph McArdle	G&C 30566.255-US-U1	8147
SS895 900000000000000000000000000000000000			EXAMINER	
			MORRISON, JAY A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/09/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/656.020 MCARDLE ET AL. Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary Fyaminer Art I Init JAY A. MORRISON 2168 All Participants: Status of Application: Notice of Allowance issued (1) JAY A. MORRISON. (3) _____. (2) Jason S. Feldmar (Reg No. 39,187). (4) _____. Date of Interview: 8 March 2011 Time: 2pm EST Type of Interview: ▼ Telephonic ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Tyes No. If Yes, provide a brief description: Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: None Claims discussed: 5.35-39 Prior art documents discussed: None Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet Part III X It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. /Jay A Morrison/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2168 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 10/656,020

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: This application was allowed on 1725/2011, but it was subsequently discovered that in the RCE filed 1716/2011, original claims 36-39 each depend from cancelled original claim 5, and they should each depend from original claim 35. The Applicant agreed that this was a typing mistake and gave permission for the correction making original claims 36-39 each depend from original claim 35 (or renumbered claims 6-9 will each depend from renumbered original claims 36-39 each depend from enumbered original claims 36-39 will be made when the patent is issued. This resolves all issues regarding this Application and it should proceed to issue as a result, since the Notice of Allowability was issued.